Draft version April 25, 2016
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1604.06590v1 [astro-ph.HE] 22 Apr 2016

CONSTRAINING MAGNETIZATION OF GAMMA-RAY BURSTS OUTFLOWS USING PROMPT EMISSION FLUENCE

Asaf Pe'er [1]

Draft version April 25, 2016

ABSTRACT

I consider here acceleration and heating of relativistic outflow by local magnetic energy dissipation process in Poynting flux dominated outflow. Adopting the standard assumption that the reconnection rate scales with the Alfvén speed, I show here that the fraction of energy dissipated as thermal photons cannot exceed $(13\hat{\gamma}-14)^{-1}=30\%$ (for adiabatic index $\hat{\gamma}=4/3$) of the kinetic energy at the photosphere. Even in the most radiatively efficient scenario, the energy released as non-thermal photons during the prompt phase is at most equal to the kinetic energy of the outflow. These results imply that calorimetry of the kinetic energy that can be done during the afterglow phase, could be used to constrain the magnetization of gamma-ray bursts (GRB) outflows.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the key open questions in the study of relativistic outflows is the mechanism responsible for accelerating the plasma to ultra-relativistic speeds, with inferred Lorentz factor $\Gamma \gtrsim$ few tens in active galactic nuclei (AGNs), and $\Gamma \gtrsim 100$ in gamma-ray bursts (GRBs). In the classical GRB "fireball" model, for example, the outflow is accelerated by radiative pressure, and magnetic fields are sub-dominant (for several recent reviews see Meszaros & Rees 2014; Kumar & Zhang 2015; Pe'er 2015, and references therein). On the other hand, in recent years models in which GRB outflows are Poynting flux dominated became increasingly popular (Levinson 2006; Lyutikov 2006; Giannios 2008; Tchekhovskoy et al. 2008; Komissarov et al. 2009; Metzger et al. 2011; Zhang & Yan 2011; McKinney & Uzdensky 2012; Sironi et al. 2015).

There are indeed strong theoretical arguments in favour of Poynting flux dominated flows in GRBs. First, it is well established that the progenitor of a GRB is a compact object of solar scale, namely a black hole or neutron star. A Poynting flux dominated outflow will naturally occur if the compact object rotates and possesses a magnetic field (Blandford & Znajek 1977; Blandford & Payne 1982). The jet could tap into the rotational energy of the neutron star, black hole or accretion disk through the agency of an ordered magnetic field that threads the source (e.g., Usov 1992; Thompson 1994; Vlahakis & Königl 2001; Drenkhahn 2002; Drenkhahn & Spruit 2002; Lyutikov & Blandford 2003; Vlahakis & Königl 2003). Second, a well known problem of non-magnetized outflow models is the very low efficiency in converting the kinetic energy to the observed radiation. This must follow an episode(s) of kinetic energy dissipation. However, the leading dissipation mechanism, namely internal shock waves (Rees & Meszaros 1994) are known to be inefficient - typically, only a few % of the kinetic energy is dissipated (Mochkovitch et al. 1995; Kobayashi et al. 1997; Panaitescu et al. 1999). In Poynting flux dominated flows on the other hand, dissipation of magnetic energy can take place via a reconnection process. This process is known to provide an efficient way of converting the energy stored in the magnetic field (Drenkhahn 2002; Drenkhahn & Spruit 2002; Komissarov et al. 2009; Lyubarsky 2010; Tchekhovskoy et al. 2010; McKinney & Uzdensky 2012; Sironi et al. 2015).

The dissipated magnetic energy is converted into (1) kinetic energy of the bulk outflow motion; and (2) thermal energy of the outflow. As was long thought and recently proven numerically (Sironi & Spitkovsky 2014; Uzdensky & Spitkovsky 2014), part of the dissipated energy is used to accelerate particles to non-thermal distribution, rather than heat a thermal distribution of particles to a higher temperature. In the context of energy transfer from the magnetic field, this energy is part of the thermal energy given to the plasma (rather than the kinetic energy). The difference between thermal and non-thermal heating would be manifested in the rate in which this energy could be radiated away. One generally expects that non-thermal particles would radiatively lose their energy faster.

In the context of GRBs, if indeed cooling is efficient, (most of-) the thermal energy will be radiated away during the prompt phase, either as thermal photons at the photosphere, or as non-thermal photons above it. As opposed to that, the bulk kinetic energy could not be converted into radiation on the short time scale characterizing the prompt phase. Instead, it will gradually dissipate during the afterglow phase. Thus, measurements of the thermal and non-thermal energies during the prompt phase and comparing them to the outflow kinetic energy (that could be deduced from afterglow measurements) would put strong constraints on the validity of the magnetized model.

In this letter, I show that the maximum ratio of thermal to kinetic energy is in fact universal, and is independent on many of the model's parameters. If radiative cooling is slow, the amount of energy that can be released as thermal photons cannot exceed $(13\hat{\gamma}-14)^{-1}=30\%$ (for adiabatic index $\hat{\gamma}=4/3$) of the kinetic energy. This energy would be released at the photosphere, and will therefore be observed as a (modified) thermal component. I should stress that 30% is an absolute upper limit: since the photospheric radius is expected to be below the

[1] Physics Department, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

saturation radius (namely, occur while the flow still accelerates), only the thermal energy released up until this radius could be radiated as such. One therefore expects the observed ratio of thermal to kinetic energy to be no more than a few %. On the other extreme, if radiative cooling is efficient, the fraction of energy released as (non-thermal) photons is equal at most to the remaining kinetic energy, regardless of the unknown model parameters, such as the magnetization or the reconnection rate. This implies that within the context of Poynting-flux dominated outflow, the overall radiation observed during the prompt phase cannot exceed the kinetic energy inferred from afterglow observations. Thus, additional - or different - mechanisms must be operating in those GRBs in which the energy released during the prompt phase exceeds the kinetic energy.

This letter is organized as follows. In §2 I provide the underlying model assumptions. I then calculate the ratio of thermal to kinetic energy released for the slow cooling and fast cooling scenarios in §3. I discuss the implications of these results in view of recent GRB prompt and afterglow measurements in §4.

2. BASIC MODEL ASSUMPTIONS

As a model of Poynting-flux dominated flow, I adopt the "striped wind" model of Coroniti (1990), whose dynamics were studies by several authors (Drenkhahn 2002; Drenkhahn & Spruit 2002; Giannios 2005; Giannios & Spruit 2005; Mészáros & Rees 2011). The magnetic field in the flow changes polarity on a small scale λ due to rotation of an inclined magnetic dipole. This scale is of the order of the light cylinder in the central engine frame ($\lambda \approx 2\pi c/\Omega$, where Ω is the angular frequency of the central engine - presumably a spinning black hole). The polarity change leads to magnetic dissipation via reconnection process, which is assumed to occur at a constant rate along the jet. As a consequence, the magnetic field decays during a characteristic (comoving) time scale $\tau' = \lambda'/\epsilon v'_A$, where $v'_A \approx c$ is the comoving Alfvénic speed and $\lambda' = \Gamma\lambda$, where Γ is the Lorentz factor of the flow. All the uncertainty in the microphysics of the reconnection process is taken up by the dimensionless factor ϵ, which is often assumed in the literature a fixed value, $\epsilon = 0.1$.

Way above the Alfvénic radius (the radius in which the flow velocity is equal to the Alfvén speed), the flow is assumed to be purely radial. The dominant magnetic field component is $B = B_\phi \gg B_r, B_\theta$. For stationary case in ideal MHD, this implies that $\partial_r(\beta r B) = 0$, where β is the outflow velocity and B is the magnetic field in the observer's frame. For non-ideal MHD, the evolution of the magnetic field is given by (Drenkhahn 2002; Drenkhahn & Spruit 2002)

$$\partial_r(rub) = -\frac{rb}{c\tau'} = -\frac{rb}{c}\frac{\epsilon\Omega}{2\pi\Gamma}, \tag{1}$$

where $b = B/\sqrt{4\pi}\Gamma$ is the (normalized) magnetic field in the comoving frame, $u = \Gamma\beta$ and $\beta = (1-\Gamma^{-2})^{1/2}$ is the normalized outflow velocity.

It was shown by Drenkhahn (2002) that for Poynting flux dominated flow with $\Gamma \gg 1$, the flow accelerates as $\Gamma(r) \propto r^{1/3}$. For the purpose of this work, I point out that this is a very robust result, that is independent on the reconnection rate ($\epsilon\Omega$) and can be derived directly from Equation 1, as long as the outflow is Poynting flux dominated, $L_{pf} = \Gamma u r^2 b^2 \gg L_k$.

This result can be understood by noting the following. First, for $\Gamma \gg 1$, Equation 1 can be written as $\partial_r(L_{pf}) \simeq \partial_r(r^2\Gamma^2 b^2) \propto -(rb)^2$. Using $L = L_{pf} + L_k$, conservation of energy implies $\partial_r(L_k) = -\partial_r(L_{pf}) \propto (rb)^2$. Second, the flux of kinetic energy can be written as $L_k = \dot{M}\Gamma c^2$, where $\dot{M}$ is the mass ejection rate per time per sterad, which is assumed steady. Thus, $\partial_r(L_k) \propto \partial_r(\Gamma)$. Combined together, one obtains $\partial_r\Gamma \propto (rb)^2$. Using now the assumption $L_{pf} \gg L_k$, one finds that $L \simeq L_{pf} = \Gamma^2 r^2 b^2$ which implies $\Gamma^2\partial_r\Gamma \approx$ Const, with the solution $\Gamma(r) \propto r^{1/3}$.

Dynamic equations. The evolution of the proper mass density, ρ, energy density (excluding rest mass), e, the 4-velocity u and the magnetic field strength, b are determined by conservation of mass, energy and momentum, together with equation 1. These are combined with the equation of state, $p = (\hat{\gamma} - 1)e$, where $\hat{\gamma}$ is the adiabatic index. When radiative losses are included, these equations take the form (Drenkhahn & Spruit 2002):

$$\partial_r(r^2\rho u) = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \dot{M} = r^2\rho u c, \tag{2}$$

$$\partial_r\left[r^2\Gamma u\left(\omega + b^2\right)\right] = -r^2\Gamma\frac{\Lambda}{c}, \tag{3}$$

$$\partial_r\left[r^2\left\{\left(\omega + b^2\right)u^2 + \frac{b^2}{2} + p\right\}\right] = 2rp - r^2 u\frac{\Lambda}{c}. \tag{4}$$

Here, $\omega = e + p + \rho c^2 = \hat{\gamma}e + \rho c^2$ is the proper enthalpy density, and Λ is the (comoving) emissivity (energy radiated per unit time per unit volume), which is assumed isotropic in the comoving frame.

As the heated particles radiate their energy they cool. The emissivity takes the form

$$\Lambda = k\frac{ecu}{r}, \tag{5}$$

where k is an adjustable cooling length. In Drenkhahn & Spruit (2002), a value of $k = 0$ was taken below the photosphere, justified by the fact that in this regime the photons are coupled to the particles, while $k = 10^4$ was assumed above the photosphere. This high value was justified by the assumption of synchrotron cooling of very energetic particles in the strong magnetic field expected in this scenario. While it is far from being clear that the electrons can be accelerated very large Lorentz factors in this model (see Bégue et. al., in prep.), as I show here, in fact the exact value of k is of no importance, as long as $k \gtrsim 1$.

Before solving these equations, we note that for $k = 0$, the energy equation (3) can be integrated to obtain $L = L_{pf} + L_k + L_{th}$, where $L_k(= \dot{M}\Gamma c^2) = r^2\Gamma u c\rho c^2$ is the kinetic luminosity (per steradian) and $L_{th} = r^2\Gamma u c\hat{\gamma}e$ is the thermal luminosity (per steradian). The thermal luminosity though includes a pressure term, and therefore the available luminosity that would be observed if the thermal energy could be entirely released (e.g., at the photosphere) is $L_{th}^{ob.} = r^2\Gamma u c e$. When radiative losses are included ($k > 0$), one can further define a non-thermal luminosity by $L_{NT} = L - L_{pf} - L_{th} - L_k$.

3. UPPER LIMITS ON THE RATIO OF RADIATED TO KINETIC ENERGY

The set of Equations 1 – 4 can be simplified for the case $\Gamma \gg 1$, by noting that one can approximate $\Gamma u \simeq u^2 + 1/2$. Using this in the energy Equation 3 and plugging the result in the momentum Equation 4, one obtains

$$\partial_r \left[r^2 \left(p - \frac{\omega}{2} \right) \right] \simeq 2rp + k\frac{re}{2}. \quad (6)$$

This equation implies scaling laws on the energy and number densities, $e = e_0 r^{-7/3}$ and $\rho = \rho_0 r^{-7/3}$.

Slow cooling scenario. Let us first consider the case in which $k = 0$, namely radiative losses are dynamically unimportant. Using $\omega = \hat{\gamma} e + \rho c^2$, $p = (\hat{\gamma} - 1)e$ and the scaling laws obtained above in Equation 6, this equation becomes $\rho_0 c^2 = (13\hat{\gamma} - 14)e_0$, or

$$\frac{L_{th}^{ob}}{L_k} = \frac{e_0}{\rho_0 c^2} = \frac{1}{13\hat{\gamma} - 14} = \frac{3}{10}, \quad (7)$$

where the last equality holds for $\hat{\gamma} = 4/3$ (for $\hat{\gamma} = 5/3$, one finds $e_0/\rho_0 c^2 = 3/23$). I stress that this is an absolute upper limit that can be obtained only if the photospheric radius is above the saturation radius (this depends on the reconnection rate). Typically, this is not the case, and the ratio L_{th}^{ob}/L_k is significantly less than that obtained in equation 7.

Fast cooling scenario. From Equation 6, it is clear that for $k \gg 4(\hat{\gamma} - 1) \simeq 1$, the second term in the right hand side always dominates the first term. The scaling laws for e and ρ are not changed, implying that Equation 6 takes the form

$$\left(1 - \frac{\hat{\gamma}}{2}\right) e_0 + \frac{\rho_0 c^2}{2} = \frac{3}{2} k e_0, \quad (8)$$

or (for $k \gg 1$)

$$\frac{L_{th}^{ob}}{L_k} = \frac{e_0}{\rho_0 c^2} \simeq \frac{1}{3k}. \quad (9)$$

One therefore concludes that for $k \gg 1$, the observed thermal luminosity, L_{th}^{ob} can be neglected with respect to the kinetic luminosity, L_k.

Using the result $ke = \rho c^2/3$ and neglecting L_{th} relative to L_k and L_{pf}, the energy Equation (3) takes the form

$$\partial_r \left(L_k + L_{pf} \right) = -\frac{L_k}{3r}. \quad (10)$$

Since $L_{NT} \simeq L - L_{pf} - L_k$, and L is constant, Equation 10 can be written as

$$\partial_r \left(L_{NT} \right) = \frac{L_k}{3r}. \quad (11)$$

During the acceleration episode, in the regime where $\Gamma \gg 1$ the kinetic luminosity scales as $L_k \propto r^{1/3}$ (this result is immediately obtained from the scaling laws of ρ and Γ). Equation 11 therefore implies both a similar scaling law of $L_{NT} \propto r^{1/3}$, and a similar scaling coefficient. This means that at the end of the acceleration, $L_{NT} = L_K$, namely up to 1/2 of the dissipated magnetic energy could be radiated away, while the other 1/2 remains in the form of kinetic energy. Further note that this result is very robust, and is independent on any of the unknown model parameters, neither on the adiabatic index. It holds for any value of $k \gg 1$. Similar to the thermal emission calculation, this is an upper limit, which depends on the assumption of strong emissivity along the jet. In reality, all emission mechanism (synchrotron, Compton, Bremsstrahlung, etc.) will decay with radius, making the observed non-thermal energy to be less than the kinetic energy (see Bégué & Pe'er 2015, Bégue et. el., in prep.)



FIG. 1.— Evolution of the bulk Lorentz factor

In order to demonstrate the validity of the analytical approximations used in deriving these conclusions, I have solved numerically the exact set of Equations 1 – 4, to find the radial evolution of the dynamical variables (Γ, e, ρ and b) and the derived variables (such as L_{pf}, L_k, L_{th}, L_{NT} and u). These set of equations are coupled and stiff, and thus in order to solve them, I first re-wrote them in terms of a variable $\vec{A} = \{L_{pf},\ L_k,\ L_{th},\ u\}$, and then calculated $d\log(\vec{A})/d\log(r)$. When formulated in this way, standard numerical ordinary differential equation (ODE) solver could be used.

The results of the numerical calculations are shown in Figures 1 – 3. In producing the results, I chose as initial conditions $L = 10^{52}$ erg s^{-1} sterad^{-1}, initial magnetization parameter $\sigma_0 \equiv L_{pf,0}/L_{k,0} = 100$ at $r_0 = 10^7$ cm (corresponding to an initial 4-velocity $u_0 = \sqrt{\sigma_0} = 10$), and reconnection rate $\epsilon\Omega = 10^3$ s^{-1}. The flow was assumed initially cold ($e_0 \equiv e|_{r_0} = 0$), and adiabatic index $\hat{\gamma} = 4/3$ assumed (this is relevant below the photosphere). I chose three different values of $k = 0, 10, 100$ representing possible different emissivities.

In Figure 1 I present the evolution of the bulk Lorentz factor. For $k = 0$ case, the outflow terminates at $\Gamma \simeq \sigma_0^{3/2} = 1000$, as predicted by Drenkhahn (2002). In the radiative scenarios, the terminal Lorentz factor is slightly above half of that value (540 and 525 for the $k = 10, 100$ scenarios, respectively), in accordance with the finding that slightly over half of the final energy is in kinetic form.

In figure 2 I show the radial evolution of the various luminosities: L_{pf}, L_k, L_{th} and L_{NT} for the $k = 0$ and $k = 10$ scenarios (the results obtained for $k = 100$ are very similar to the ones obtained for $k = 10$, and are thus omitted for clarity). All the numerical results are in accordance with the analytical calculations presented above. In particular, when non-thermal radiation



FIG. 2.— Radial evolution of the luminosities. Think (blue) curves are for $k = 0$ scenario, while thin (green) are for the radiative case with $k = 10$. Solid: L_k, dotted: L_{pf}, dash-dotted: L_{th} and dash: L_{NT}. As explain in the text, for large k, the magnetic energy is equally distributed between kinetic and radiated energy, and thus L_{NT} approaches L_k.



FIG. 3.— Ratio of observed to kinetic luminosities. Thick (blue): $k = 0$ scenario. $L_{th}^{ob}/L_k = 0.3$ (for adiabatic index $\hat{\gamma} = 4/3$). Thin (green): $k = 10$. The non-thermal radiated energy reaches slightly less than 90% of the kinetic energy, while the thermal energy is negligible in this scenario.

is omitted ($k = 0$), the ratio between L_{th} and L_k approaches 30%. This is directly seen in Figure 3. In the radiative scenario ($k = 10$), this ratio is much lower; on the other hand, L_{NT} approaches L_k, as is seen in Figures 2 and 3.

4. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The energy released as thermal and non-thermal during the acceleration phase (L_{th} and L_{NT}) would be directly observed during the prompt phase, either as thermal photons released at the photosphere, or as non-thermal photons released at larger radii. As opposed to that, the kinetic energy (L_k) could not be directly observed during the prompt phase, unless an additional, non-magnetized dissipation process takes place. As pointed in the literature, substantial kinetic energy released by collisions is unlikely, due to the low efficiency of this process.

Instead, the kinetic energy will be gradually released during the afterglow phase: it will be used to accelerate and heat particles from the ambient medium, which will radiate the observed afterglow. Although this is a difficult task, in recent years calorimetry of GRB kinetic energy became possible using afterglow measurements (Kumar 2000; Zhang et al. 2007; Cenko et al. 2011; Racusin et al. 2011; Lazzati et al. 2013). One of the most interesting and puzzling results is the very high efficiency of radiation during the prompt phase: for the majority of bursts analyzed, it is found that the energy released as gamma-rays during the prompt phase is higher than the kinetic energy inferred from afterglow measurements (but see Beniamini et al. (2015) for a different conclusion).

As is demonstrated here, if these results hold they not only imply theoretical difficulty for the internal shocks model, but for the Poynting flux dominated models as well. This difficulty adds to the difficulty of magnetized models to account for a significant, sub-MeV thermal component (Zhang & Pe'er 2009; Bégué & Pe'er 2015) as is reported in several bursts. Interestingly, very similar results are obtained within the reconnection model suggested by Lyubarsky & Kirk (2001), in which different assumptions about the reconnection rate lead to different scaling law $\Gamma \propto r^{1/2}$.

One possible solution within the framework of Poynting-flux dominated flows is to invoke a more complicated dissipation scheme. For example, one may assume that the dissipation of the magnetic energy does not occur continuously along the jet, but only in specific regions. This could be triggered, e.g., by outflow discontinuities such as turbulence (e.g., Zhang & Yan 2011). However, detailed numerical models carried so far of more complicated outflow dynamics (McKinney & Uzdensky 2012; Deng et al. 2015) did not reveal a substantially different dynamics than the simple 1-d model analyzed in this work, nor better efficiency than derived here. Another possibility is Compton drag (namely, the emitted radiation is non-isotropic in the comoving frame). In this scenario, somewhat higher efficiency could be achieved under the appropriate conditions (Levinson & Globus 2016).

Alternatively, most of the prompt emission photons may have a different origin. An appealing alternative is emission from the photosphere. Thermal photons may exist in the plasma at early stages, and advect with it until the photosphere, in which they decouple. Thus, their existence does not require high efficiency in kinetic or magnetic energy conversion. In recent years, it was demonstrated that the observed spectrum of photons emerging from the photosphere can deviate substantially from the naively expected "Planck" spectrum. This is due to both light aberration effects (Pe'er 2008; Lundman et al. 2013) as well as possible sub-photospheric energy dissipation (e.g., Pe'er et al. 2006).

To conclude, I showed here that simple analytical upper limits on the ratio of L_{th}/L_k (Equation 7) and L_{NT}/L_k exist in Poynting flux dominated models. These results are robust, being independent on uncertainties such as the initial magnetization parameter, magnetic dissipation rate, cooling rate or adiabatic index. Thus, careful calorimetry of the kinetic energy that can be carried using afterglow measurements can be used to put strong constraints on the magnetization of GRB outflows.

AP wishes to thank Damien Begue, Brad Cenko, Amir Levinson, Yuri Lyubarski, Raffaella Margutti and Bing Zhang for useful comments. This research was partially supported by the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 618499. I further wish to acknowledge support from NASA under grant #NNX12AO83G.

REFERENCES

Bégué, D. & Pe'er, A. 2015, ApJ, 802, 134
Beniamini, P., Nava, L., Duran, R. B., & Piran, T. 2015, MNRAS, 454, 1073
Blandford, R. D. & Payne, D. G. 1982, MNRAS, 199, 883
Blandford, R. D. & Znajek, R. L. 1977, MNRAS, 179, 433
Cenko, S. B., Frail, D. A., Harrison, F. A., Haislip, J. B., Reichart, D. E., Butler, N. R., Cobb, B. E., Cucchiara, A., Berger, E., Bloom, J. S., Chandra, P., Fox, D. B., Perley, D. A., Prochaska, J. X., Filippenko, A. V., Glazebrook, K., Ivarsen, K. M., Kasliwal, M. M., Kulkarni, S. R., LaCluyze, A. P., Lopez, S., Morgan, A. N., Pettini, M., & Rana, V. R. 2011, ApJ, 732, 29
Coroniti, F. V. 1990, ApJ, 349, 538
Deng, W., Li, H., Zhang, B., & Li, S. 2015, ApJ, 805, 163
Drenkhahn, G. 2002, A&A, 387, 714
Drenkhahn, G. & Spruit, H. C. 2002, A&A, 391, 1141
Giannios, D. 2005, A&A, 437, 1007
—. 2008, A&A, 480, 305
Giannios, D. & Spruit, H. C. 2005, A&A, 430, 1
Kobayashi, S., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 1997, ApJ, 490, 92
Komissarov, S. S., Vlahakis, N., Königl, A., & Barkov, M. V. 2009, MNRAS, 394, 1182
Kumar, P. 2000, ApJ, 538, L125
Kumar, P. & Zhang, B. 2015, Phys. Rep., 561, 1
Lazzati, D., Morsony, B. J., Margutti, R., & Begelman, M. C. 2013, ApJ, 765, 103
Levinson, A. 2006, ApJ, 648, 510
Levinson, A. & Globus, N. 2016, MNRAS, 458, 2269
Lundman, C., Pe'er, A., & Ryde, F. 2013, MNRAS, 428, 2430
Lyubarsky, Y. & Kirk, J. G. 2001, ApJ, 547, 437
Lyubarsky, Y. E. 2010, MNRAS, 402, 353
Lyutikov, M. 2006, New Journal of Physics, 8, 119
Lyutikov, M. & Blandford, R. 2003, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints
McKinney, J. C. & Uzdensky, D. A. 2012, MNRAS, 419, 573
Mészáros, P. & Rees, M. J. 2011, ApJ, 733, L40
Meszaros, P. & Rees, M. J. 2014, ArXiv e-prints
Metzger, B. D., Giannios, D., Thompson, T. A., Bucciantini, N., & Quataert, E. 2011, MNRAS, 413, 2031
Mochkovitch, R., Maitia, V., & Marques, R. 1995, Ap&SS, 231, 441
Panaitescu, A., Spada, M., & Mészáros, P. 1999, ApJ, 522, L105
Pe'er, A. 2008, ApJ, 682, 463
—. 2015, Advances in Astronomy, 2015, 907321
Pe'er, A., Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 2006, ApJ, 642, 995
Racusin, J. L., Oates, S. R., Schady, P., Burrows, D. N., de Pasquale, M., Donato, D., Gehrels, N., Koch, S., McEnery, J., Piran, T., Roming, P., Sakamoto, T., Swenson, C., Troja, E., Vasileiou, V., Virgili, F., Wanderman, D., & Zhang, B. 2011, ApJ, 738, 138
Rees, M. J. & Meszaros, P. 1994, ApJ, 430, L93
Sironi, L., Petropoulou, M., & Giannios, D. 2015, MNRAS, 450, 183
Sironi, L. & Spitkovsky, A. 2014, ApJ, 783, L21
Tchekhovskoy, A., McKinney, J. C., & Narayan, R. 2008, MNRAS, 388, 551
Tchekhovskoy, A., Narayan, R., & McKinney, J. C. 2010, New Astr., 15, 749
Thompson, C. 1994, MNRAS, 270, 480
Usov, V. V. 1992, Nature, 357, 472
Uzdensky, D. A. & Spitkovsky, A. 2014, ApJ, 780, 3
Vlahakis, N. & Königl, A. 2001, ApJ, 563, L129
—. 2003, ApJ, 596, 1080
Zhang, B., Liang, E., Page, K. L., Grupe, D., Zhang, B.-B., Barthelmy, S. D., Burrows, D. N., Campana, S., Chincarini, G., Gehrels, N., Kobayashi, S., Mészáros, P., Moretti, A., Nousek, J. A., O'Brien, P. T., Osborne, J. P., Roming, P. W. A., Sakamoto, T., Schady, P., & Willingale, R. 2007, ApJ, 655, 989
Zhang, B. & Pe'er, A. 2009, ApJ, 700, L65
Zhang, B. & Yan, H. 2011, ApJ, 726, 90